

**BEFORE**

**THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

**DOCKET NOS. 2010-14--19-C**

IN RE:	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v.	)	
Affordable Phone Services, Incorporated	)	
d/b/a High Tech Communications	)	
<b>Docket No. 2010-14-C</b>	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. Dialtone	)	
& More Incorporated	)	
<b>Docket No. 2010-15-C</b>	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v.	)	
Tennessee Telephone Service, LLC	)	
d/b/a Freedom Communications USA,	)	<b>JOINT MOTION ON PROCEDURAL</b>
LLC	)	<b>ISSUES</b>
<b>Docket No. 2010-16-C</b>	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. OneTone	)	
Telecom, Incorporated	)	
<b>Docket No. 2010-17-C</b>	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. dPi	)	
Teleconnect, LLC	)	
<b>Docket No. 2010-18-C</b>	)	
	)	
BellSouth Telecommunications,	)	
Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast	)	
d/b/a AT&T South Carolina v. Image	)	
Access, Incorporated d/b/a New Phone	)	
<b>Docket No. 2010-19-C</b>	)	

All of the above-captioned proceedings are similar, not only to each other but to cases pending before the regulatory commissions of eight other states (the states of the former BellSouth region).<sup>1</sup> To promote the reasonable, efficient, and expeditious determination of these proceedings, BellSouth Telecommunications, Incorporated d/b/a AT&T Southeast d/b/a AT&T South Carolina (“Complainant”), and the all Respondents in the above-listed Dockets (collectively the “Parties”), without objection from the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff (“ORS”) respectfully submit the following Joint Motion concerning procedural issues.

The Parties respectfully request that the Commission:

1. Hold all other pending motions in abeyance; and
2. Convene a consolidated proceeding (Consolidated Phase), to which the Complainant and all Respondents are parties, to resolve the following issues:<sup>2</sup>
  - (a) how cash back credits to the resellers should be calculated;
  - (b) whether the word-of-mouth promotion is available for resale and, if so, how the credits to resellers should be calculated; and
  - (c) how credits to resellers for waiver of the line connection charge should be calculated.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Joint Motion is also being filed in each of the other states.

<sup>2</sup> The Parties are not asking the Commission to decide any other issues, including without limitation issues related to AT&T’s announcement of its intent to change its formula for calculating cashback credits, in the Consolidated Phase. This Joint Motion, however, does not limit the *arguments* which may be made by any Party in the Consolidated Phase. Any Party may raise any arguments it believes are relevant to the Consolidated Phase, whether or not such arguments also relate to claims outside the Consolidated Phase. Similarly, AT&T may object to any arguments it believes are irrelevant or object for any other reason, but it will not object on the grounds that raising arguments related to other claims is inconsistent with this Joint Motion.

If the Commission approves this Joint Motion, the Parties and the ORS will work in good faith to propose by June 11, 2010, a procedural schedule for a Consolidated Phase hearing in each of the nine states.<sup>3</sup>

Once the Commission has issued an order resolving the issues in the Consolidated Phase, the Parties (and the ORS) will work in good faith to address or, if necessary, request the Commission to resolve, all remaining unresolved claims and counterclaims related to the Consolidated Phase and determine what, if any, dollar amounts are owed or credits due each Party. As stated below, any individual Party may also seek to pursue in its respective docket, either concurrent with or following the Consolidated Phase, any issue, claim, or counterclaim, including related discovery, that is not addressed in the Consolidated Phase.

Nothing in this Joint Motion is intended, or shall be construed, as a waiver of any Party's pending motions, claims, counterclaims or defenses or any Party's right to amend and supplement its claims, counterclaims, or other pleadings, or to pursue any issue, claim, or counterclaim that is not addressed in the Consolidated Phase in each Party's respective docket, either concurrent with or following the Consolidated Phase, or to seek such other relief as a change in circumstances may warrant.

[signature page to follow]

---

<sup>3</sup> This is similar to the approach taken by pre-merger BellSouth and the parties to the Commission's dockets addressing the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO") and its progeny. Those parties presented a coordinated, region-wide schedule that resulted in the expeditious resolution of those proceedings on a regional basis.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John J. Pringle, Jr.

John J. Pringle, Jr.

Austin M. Smith

Ellis, Lawhorne & Sims, P.A.

P.O. Box 2285

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Telephone: (803) 343-1270

Facsimile: (803) 799-8479

[jpringle@ellislawhorne.com](mailto:jpringle@ellislawhorne.com)

/s/ Patrick W. Turner

Patrick W. Turner

AT&T South Carolina

1600 Williams Street

Suite 5200

Columbia SC 29201

Telephone: (803) 401-2900

Facsimile: (803) 254-1731

[patrick.turner1@att.com](mailto:patrick.turner1@att.com)

May 20, 2010

Columbia, South Carolina

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing has been served by electronic mail service on the following this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2010:

Patrick W. Turner, Esquire  
AT&T South Carolina  
[Pt1285@att.com](mailto:Pt1285@att.com)

Lessie Hammonds, Esquire  
S.C. Office of Regulatory Staff  
lhammon@regstaff.sc.gov

/s/ John J. Pringle, Jr.